[10th October 1928

Mr. G. Harisarvottama Rao:—"May I know from the hon. the Home Member whether the Government have considered in refusing to accept the resolution even at this stage that they are unable to give us accurate figures as to the dismissals and punishments comparatively in the times of the three Superintendents?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur:—"As I said, the Government have no information."

Leave application of a reader in Government Press.

*469 Q.—Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether Mr. N. A. Balasubramaniam, a reader in the Government Press, applied for six weeks' leave on 12th October 1927 on production of medical certificate from a L.M.P.;

(*b*) whether he was directed to appear before the Surgeon, First District;

(*c*) whether the Surgeon declared him fit for duty on 16th October 1927;

(*d*) whether he joined duty on 17th October 1927 and applied for leave;

(*e*) whether the Superintendent treated his absence as leave but as leave without pay; and whether the applicant had about two years' leave on average salary to his credit at the time;

(*f*) whether the action of the Superintendent was against instructions contained in Government Memorandum No. 1002-2, Finance, dated 17th February 1926; and

(*g*) what action was taken against the Superintendent for disregarding a Government Order?

A.—(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) Yes, on 22nd October 1927.

(*c*) No, the Surgeon reported on 16th November 1927 that he was fit for duty. He had delayed 24 days before appearing before the Surgeon.

(*d*) He joined duty on 17th November 1927.

(*e*) The Superintendent treated the period of his absence as absence without leave. Government are not aware of the amount of leave at his credit.

(*f*) No.

(*g*) The question does not arise.

11-30 a.m. Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar:—"Sir, with reference to the answer to clause (*e*), in view of the fact that the question itself gives definite information, is it not the duty of the Government to verify the truth of this statement?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur:—"The Government have no information."

Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar:—"Will they not call for the information?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur:—"We will do so if it is necessary."

10th October 1928]

Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar :—" Does the hon. the Home Member think that the Superintendent is justified in his action if the facts are as stated in the question ? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur :— " The Superintendent is justified."

Mr. G. Harisarvottama Rao :—" May I know from the hon. the Home Member whether he thinks that he should justify the Superintendent even before he had learnt whether the employee had to his credit two years' leave or not ? "

Mr. P. Baktavatsulu Nayudu :—" Is it not possible for the Government to be aware of these things if they are really interested ? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur :— " That does not affect the question."

Police

Oriyas as gazetted officers in the Police Department.

* 470 Q.—Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo : Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) the number of Oriyas serving as gazetted officers in the Police Department ;

(b) if there are no Oriya officers the reasons for the same ;

(c) the number of Oriya candidates who appeared for the selection of Deputy Superintendents of Police ; and

(d) the number of Oriyas now serving as Circle Inspectors of Police ?

A.—(a) None.

(b) A report on the subject will be called for.

(c)—

1925	One
1926	Two
1927	Nil.

(d) Eleven.

Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo :—" With reference to (b), may I know whether the Government will be pleased to place the report on the table of this House and with reference to (d), whether they will be prepared to consider the claims of the existing members who are serving as Circle Inspectors ? "

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur :— " When the report reaches the Government the suggestion will be considered."

Alleged treatment of the accused under trial in the Trichinopoly Railway strike case.

* 471 Q.—Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar : Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received a communication from Mr. N. S Ramaswami Ayyangar protesting against the treatment alleged to have been accorded to the accused under trial in the Trichinopoly Railway strike conspiracy case ;